

Brain as quantum-like computer

Andrei Khrennikov*

International Center for Mathematical Modeling
in Physics and Cognitive Sciences,
MSI, University of Växjö, S-35195, Sweden
Email: Andrei.Khrennikov@msi.vxu.se

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We present a contextualist statistical realistic model for quantum-like representations in physics, cognitive science and psychology. We apply this model to describe cognitive experiments to check quantum-like structures of mental processes. The crucial role is played by interference of probabilities for mental observables. Recently one of such experiments based on recognition of images was performed. This experiment confirmed our prediction on quantum-like behaviour of mind. In our approach “quantumness of mind” has no direct relation to the fact that the brain (as any physical body) is composed of quantum particles. We invented a new terminology “quantum-like (QL) mind.” Cognitive QL-behaviour is characterized by nonzero coefficient of interference λ . This coefficient can be found on the basis of statistical data. There is predicted not only $\cos \theta$ -interference of probabilities, but also hyperbolic $\cosh \theta$ -interference. This interference was never observed for physical systems, but we could not exclude this possibility for cognitive systems. We propose a model of brain functioning as QL-computer (there is discussed difference between quantum and QL computers).

*Supported in part by the EU Human Potential Programme, contact HPRN-CT-2002-00279 (Network on Quantum Probability and Applications) and Profile Math. Modelling of Växjö University.

1 Introduction

The idea that the description of brain functioning, cognition and consciousness could not be reduced to the theory of neural networks and dynamical systems (cf. Ashby (1952), Hopfield (1982), Amit (1989), Bechtel and Abrahamsen (1991), Strogatz (1994), van Gelder (1995), van Gelder and Port (1995), Eliasmith (1996)) and that quantum theory may play an important role in such a description was discussed in the huge variety of forms, see e.g. Whitehead (1929, 1933, 1939), Orlov (1982), Healey (1984), Albert and Loewer (1988, 1992), Lockwood (1989, 1996), Penrose (1989, 1994), Donald (1990, 1995, 1996), Jibu and Yasue (1992, 1994), Bohm and Hiley (1993), Stapp (1993), Hameroff (1994, 1998), Loewer (1996), Hiley and Pylikäinen (1997), Deutsch (1997), Barrett (1999), Khrennikov (1999, 2000), Hiley (2000), Vitiello (2001) and literature thereby. One of dominating approaches to application of quantum mechanics to the description of brain functioning is *quantum reductionism*, see e.g. Hameroff (1994, 1998) and R. Penrose (1989, 1994). This was a new attempt of physical reduction of mental processes, cf. Ashby (1952), Hopfield (1982), Amit (1989). This is an interesting project of great complexity and it is too early to try to make any conclusion about its future. One of important contributions of quantum reductionism in the study of mental processes is the strong critique of the classical reductionist approach (neural networks and dynamical systems approach) and artificial intelligence, see especially Penrose (1994). On the other hand, quantum reductionism was strongly criticized by neurophysiologists and cognitive scientists who still belief that neuron is the basic unit of procession of mental information. We can also mention the *quantum logic* approach: mind cannot be described by classical logic and therefore the formalism of quantum logic should be applied. It seems that Orlov (1982) published the first paper in which this idea was explored. It is important to remark that he discussed interference within a single mind (this is natural in quantum logic). Such an interference was also discussed by Deutsch (1997). We pay attention to extended investigations based on *many-minds* approach, see Healey (1984), Albert and Loewer (1988, 1992), Lockwood (1989, 1996), Donald (1990, 1995, 1996), Loewer (1996), Barrett (1999), etc. Finally, we pay attention to attempts to apply *Bohmian mechanics* for description of mental processes – Bohm and Hiley (1993), Hiley and Pylikäinen (1997), Hiley (2000), Khrennikov (1999, 2000), Choustova (2004).

In this paper we also develop a kind of quantum theory of mind. From

the very beginning we emphasize that our approach has nothing to do with quantum reductionism. Of course, we do not claim that our approach implies that quantum physical reduction of mind is totally impossible. But our approach could explain the main quantum-like (QL) feature of mind – *interference of minds* – without reduction of mental processes to quantum physical processes. Regarding the quantum logic approach we can say that our contextual statistical model is quite close mathematically to some models of quantum logic (especially Mackey’s model, see e.g. Mackey (1963)), but interpretations of mathematical formalisms are totally different. The crucial point is that in our probabilistic model it is possible to combine *realism* with the main distinguishing features of quantum probabilistic formalism such as *interference of probabilities*, *Born’s rule*, *complex probabilistic amplitudes*, *Hilbert state space*, *representation of (realistic) observables by operators*.

Why is the possibility to combine realism with quantum probabilistic features so important for neurophysiology, cognitive sciences, psychology and sociology?

A fundamental consequence of the possibility of such a combination is that macroscopic neuronal structures (in particular, a single neuron) as well as cognitive and psychological contexts could exhibit quantum-like features. Thus we may escape the fundamental problem that disturbs so much the program of the quantum physical reductionism:

How might one combine the neuronal and quantum models?

This was a terrible problem e.g. for Penrose (1994): “It is hard to see how one could usefully consider a quantum superposition consisting of one neuron *firing*, and simultaneously *nonfiring*.”

In our contextual statistical model it is possible to operate with quantum-like probabilities without such a notion as *superposition of states of a single system*. All distinguishing probabilistic features of quantum mechanics can be obtained without it. This implies that (in the opposite to quantum reductionists) we need not look for some microscopic basis of mental processes.¹ In our model “*mental interference*” is not based on superposition of individual quantum states. Mental interference is described in classical (but contextual) probabilistic framework. A *mental wave function* represent not

¹We remark that reductionists should do this and go to the deepest scales of space and time to find some resonable explanation of superposition and interference (S. Homeroff should go inside *microtubules* and R. Penrose even deeper – to scales of *quantum gravity*).

a mental state of an individual cognitive system, but a neurophysiological, cognitive or psychological context C .²

As was already remarked, from the mathematical point of view our probabilistic model is quite close to the well known Mackey's model.³ George Mackey (1963) presented a program of huge complexity and importance:

To deduce the probabilistic formalism of quantum mechanics starting with a system of natural probabilistic axioms.

(Here "natural" has the meaning a natural formulation in classical probabilistic terms.) G. Mackey tried to realize this program starting with a system of 8 axioms – Mackey axioms, see Mackey (1963). This was an important step in clarification of the probabilistic structure of quantum mechanics. However, he did not totally succeed (as was recognized by himself, see Mackey (1963) and section 2 for details). The crucial axiom (about the complex Hilbert space) was not formulated in natural (classical) probabilistic terms.

In Khrennikov (2001, 2002, 2003) there was presented a new attempt of realization of Mackey's program. In our approach the probabilistic structure of quantum mechanics (including the complex Hilbert space) can be derived on the basis of two axioms formulated in classical (but contextual!) probabilistic terms. This realization of Mackey's program gives the possibility to combine realism and quantum probabilistic behavior (see previous discussion on quantum reductionism of mental processes).

Comparing the Bohmian mental models and our contextual quantum-like model we can say that our model does not provide individual description of

²We again pay attention that our comparison of contextual approach and quantum reductionism could not be used as an argument against the last one. One could not exclude the possibility that mental processes could be reduced to quantum physical processes, e.g. in microtubules, or that the act of consciousness is really induced by the collapse of a wave function of superposition of two mass states. But our model gives the possibility to proceed with quantum mathematical formalism in neurophysiology, cognitive science, psychology and sociology without using all those tricky things that are so important in the reductionist approach.

³In fact, Mackey's work (1963) was the starting point of my investigations and I was really lucky that I met George Mackey at the conference of "Quantum Structures Association" (Castiglioncello, Italy, 1992) and discussed with him probabilistic foundations of quantum mechanics. I also was strongly influenced by Stan Gudder. His papers, see e.g. Gudder (2001), as well as numerous discussions with him played an important role in creation of my contextual statistical realistic model. General philosophic debates with C. Fuchs and A. Plotnitsky, see even Fuchs (2002) and Plotnitsky (2002), played an important role in creation of so called Växjö interpretation, see Khrennikov (2002).

mental processes. We could not describe a “trajectory of an individual mind”, we are able only describe “probability distributions of minds.” By using the terminology of Atmanspacher et al. (2001) we can say that Bohmian mental models provide the ontic description of mental processes and our model provides the epistemic description. Our epistemic (contextual probabilistic) model does not contradict to the possibility that on the ontic level mental world can be described by Bohmian mechanics. On the other hand, our model does not imply that precisely Bohmian mechanics is the right ontic mental model. In principle, there might be found other ontic mental models which could be more adequate the problem under consideration. Another fundamental feature of Bohmian mechanics is its *nonlocality*. Nonlocality of this model has important consequences for cognitive science; especially the problem of consciousness. Bohm, Hiley and Pyllkkänen developed a new philosophic systems – philosophy of wholeness and applied it to the problem of consiousness. Khrennikov (1999, 2000) proposed a mathematical model of *mental space* given by an infinite p -adic tree. Minds were represented by infinite branches of tree; they were coupled by mental pilot waves. In Choustova (2004) there was presented a model of psycho-financial market with traders coupled by mental pilot waves.

We say a few words about many-minds approach: Healey (1984), Albert and Loewer (1988, 1992), Lockwood (1989, 1996), Donald (1990, 1995, 1996), Loewer (1996), Barrett (1999), etc.. This approach played an important role in justification of the many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics. There is no direct contradiction between our contextual realistic and many-worlds interpretations. We recall that the many-worlds interpretation was invented as an attempt to explain some mysteries of quantum mechanics. We agree that there were naturally explained a few things that were really mysterious in the orthodox Copenhagen interpretation.⁴ In particular, it seems that only the many-worlds interpretation provides a reasonable explanation of *quantum parallelism* (which plays the fundamental role in quantum computing). Therefore many-minds interpretation is so natural for various models of brain as a physical device performing quantum computations. We also can escape conventional Copenhagen mysteries by using our contextual realistic model. Connections between our model and the many-worlds/many-minds approaches will be discussed in more detail in section 12.

⁴This interpretation is typically considered in the quantum reductionist approach.

Before having a closer look at our model, it is perhaps necessary to discuss the meaning of the term *contextuality*, as it can obviously be interpreted in many different ways. The most common meaning (especially in the literature on quantum logic) is that the outcome for a measurement of an observable u under a contextual model is calculated using a different (albeit hidden) measure space, depending on whether or not compatible observables $v, w, \dots$ were also made in the same experiment. We remark that well known “no-go” theorems cannot be applied to such contextual models.⁵

In our approach the term contextuality is used in a totally different meaning. Roughly speaking our approach is noncontextual from the conventional viewpoint. Values associated to two specially chosen observables – the *reference observables*⁶ – are considered as objective properties of systems (physical, cognitive, ..., social). These observables are therefore not contextual in the sense of Bohr’s measurement contextuality.

The basic notion of our approach is the *context* – that is, a complex of physical, biological, cognitive, psychological, social, or economic conditions. Systems (physical, biological, ..., economic) interact with a context C and in this process a statistical ensemble S_C is formed; cf. e.g. Ballentine (2001).⁷

Conditional (or better to say contextual) probabilities for reference observables, $\mathbf{P}(a = y/C), \mathbf{P}(b = x/C)$, are used to represent the context C by a complex probability amplitude ψ_C . This amplitude is in fact encoded in a *generalization of the formula of total probability describing the interference of probabilities*. Note that interferences of probabilities can thus be obtained in a classical probabilistic framework (i.e., without the need of the Hilbert space formalism), an observation which was actually the starting point of our considerations. Our approach is thus based on two cornerstones:

⁵This approach to contextuality can be considered as a mathematical formalization of *Bohr’s measurement contextuality*, see Plotnitsky (2001, 2002) for details. Bohr’s interpretation of quantum mechanics is in fact considered as contextual; for N. Bohr the word “context” had the meaning of a “*context of a measurement*.”

⁶For example, physical observables, or observables on neuronal structures, or observables corresponding to performing of cognitive or psychological tasks, or questions asked to a group of people. E.g., position and momentum in physics; in Conte et al. (2004) there were considered two cognitive tasks based on recognition of hidden structures of two different images.

⁷The notion of context is close to the notion of preparation procedure, see e.g. Holevo (2001). However, for any preparation procedure $\mathcal{E}$, it is assumed that this procedure could be (at least in principle) realized experimentally. We do not assume this for an arbitrary context C .

a) *contextuality of probabilities;*

b) *the use of two fixed incompatible observables (physical, biological, cognitive, psychological, social, or economic) in order to represent the classical contextual probabilistic model in the complex Hilbert space.*

Section 2.1 is devoted to the presentation of our general contextual statistical model (Växjö model); in section 2.2. there is considered the ensemble representation of contextual statistical models (cf. with so called statistical interpretation of quantum mechanics of Einstein, Margenau, ..., see e.g. Ballentine (2001), Holevo (2001); in section 2.3 we discuss the possibility to apply this model outside physics (in particular, in cognitive science, psychology and sociology). In sections 4–10 we apply our model to description of mental observations in the quantum-like terms. We start with *mental interference* which is defined as interference of probability distributions of two *incompatible mental observables*. For example, in psychology such observables can be realized in the form of two incompatible questions which are asked to people participating in a test.

In our model *incompatibility of two mental observables* is defined in purely classical probabilistic terms.⁸ A condition of incompatibility can be easily checked on the basis of experimental statistical data collected e.g. in the form of “yes-no” answers to questions. The magnitude of mental interference is characterized by a coefficient of interference (or incompatibility) λ . Depending on this magnitude we obtain different representations of probabilities in experiments with cognitive systems. In particular, we obtain the quantum-like representation in the complex Hilbert space.

This approach should be justified experimentally. A priori there are no reasons that cognitive systems may exhibit the quantum-like probabilistic behaviour; in particular, nontrivial mental interference. Therefore we presented the detailed description of an experimental test to check the hypothesis on the quantum-like probabilistic behaviour. We hope that such tests would be performed in various domains of mental sciences: psychology, cognitive science, sociology, economics. Some preliminary experiments were already done Conte et al. (2004) and they confirmed that in some psychological experiments students can exhibit quantum-like probabilistic behaviour. In section 8 we present a model of brain’s functioning as QL-computer. There

⁸This classical probabilistic incompatibility implies noncommutativity of operators $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{b}$ corresponding to mental observables a and b . But such a representation is not basic; it is induced by classical (contextual) probabilistic representation.

is discussed difference between conventional quantum and QL computers, especially regarding to quantum parallelism. In section 12 we shall compare in more detail the many-minds and Văxjö approaches. Finally, in section 13 we discuss the notion of *macroscopic quantum system* and give motivations to consider human beings as macroscopic quantum systems.

The paper is written to be readable by researchers working in biology, cognitive and social sciences, psychology. There is used not so much mathematics. Only in section 5 we present rather long mathematical expressions. In principle, this section can be omitted if one accepts that there exists an algorithm which gives the possibility to construct a complex probability amplitude – “wave function” – on the basis of contextual probabilities.

2 Contextual statistical realistic model

A general statistical realistic model for observables based on the contextual viewpoint to probability will be presented. It will be shown that classical as well as quantum probabilistic models can be obtained as particular cases of our general contextual model, the *Văxjö model*.⁹ Realism is one of the main distinguishing features of the Văxjö model since it is always possible manipulate objective properties, despite the presence of such essentially quantum effects as, e.g., the interference of probabilities.

As George W. Mackey (1963) pointed out, probabilities cannot be considered as abstract quantities defined outside any reference to a concrete complex of physical conditions C . All probabilities are conditional or better to say contextual.¹⁰ G. Mackey did a lot to unify classical and quantum probabilistic description and, in particular, demystify quantum probability. One crucial step is however missing in Mackey’s work. In his book Mackey (1963) introduced the quantum probabilistic model (based on the complex Hilbert space) by means of a special axiom (Axiom 7, p. 71) that looked rather artificial in his general conditional probabilistic framework.

⁹This model is not reduced to the conventional, classical and quantum models. In particular, it contains a new statistical model: a model with hyperbolic *cosh*-interference that induces “hyperbolic quantum mechanics”, Khrennikov (2003).

¹⁰We remark that the same point of view can be found in the works of A. N. Kolmogorov and R. von Mises. However, it seems that Mackey’s book was the first thorough presentation of a program of conditional probabilistic description of measurements, both in classical and quantum physics.

Mackey's model is based on a system of eight axioms, when our own model requires only two axioms. Let us briefly mention the content of Mackey first axioms. The first four axioms concern conditional structure of probabilities, that is, they can be considered as axioms of a classical probabilistic model. The fifth and sixth axioms are of a logical nature (about questions). We reproduce below Mackey's "quantum axiom", and Mackey's own comments on this axiom (see pp. 71-72):

Axiom 7 (G. Mackey) *The partially ordered set of all questions in quantum mechanics is isomorphic to the partially ordered set of all closed subsets of a separable, infinite dimensional Hilbert space.*¹¹

Our activity can be considered as an attempt to find a list of physically plausible assumptions from which the Hilbert space structure can be deduced. We show that this list can consist in two axioms (see our Axioms 1 and 2) and that these axioms can be formulated in the same classical probabilistic manner as Mackey's Axioms 1–4.

2.1 Contextual statistical model of observations

A physical or mental *context* C is a complex of physical or mental conditions. Contexts are fundamental elements of any contextual statistical model. Thus construction of any model M should be started with fixing the collection of contexts of this model; denote the collection of contexts by the symbol $\mathcal{C}$ (so the family of contexts $\mathcal{C}$ is determined by M). In mathematical formalism $\mathcal{C}$ is an abstract set (of "labels" of contexts). Another fundamental element of any contextual statistical model M is a set of observables $\mathcal{O}$: any observable $a \in \mathcal{O}$ can be measured under a complex of physical conditions $C \in \mathcal{C}$. For an $a \in \mathcal{O}$, we denote the set of its possible values ("spectrum") by the symbol X_a .

We do not assume that all these observables can be measured simultaneously. To simplify considerations, we shall consider only discrete observables

¹¹ "This axiom has rather a different character from Axioms 1 through 4. These all had some degree of physical naturalness and plausibility. Axiom 7 seems entirely *ad.hoc*. Why do we make it? Can we justify making it? What else might we assume? We shall discuss these questions in turn. The first is the easiest to answer. We make it because it "works", that is, it leads to a theory which explains physical phenomena and successfully predicts the results of experiments. It is conceivable that a quite different assumption would do likewise but this is a possibility that no one seems to have explored. Ideally one would like to have a list of physically plausible assumptions from which one could deduce Axiom 7."

and, moreover, all concrete investigations will be performed for *dichotomous observables*.

Axiom 1: *For any observable $a \in \mathcal{O}$, there are defined contexts C_α corresponding to α -filtrations: if we perform a measurement of a under the complex of physical conditions C_α , then we obtain the value $a = \alpha$ with probability 1. It is supposed that the set of contexts $\mathcal{C}$ contains filtration-contexts C_α for all observables $a \in \mathcal{O}$.*

Axiom 2: *There are defined contextual probabilities $\mathbf{P}(a = \alpha/C)$ for any context $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and any observable $a \in \mathcal{O}$.*

Probabilities $\mathbf{P}(b = \beta/C)$ are interpreted as *contextual (conditional) probabilities*. Especially important role will be played by probabilities:

$$p^{a/b}(\alpha/\beta) \equiv \mathbf{P}(a = \alpha/C_\beta), a, b \in \mathcal{O}, \alpha \in X_a, \beta \in X_b,$$

where C_β is the $[b = \beta]$ -filtration context. For any $C \in \mathcal{C}$, there is defined the set of probabilities: $\{\mathbf{P}(a = \alpha/C) : a \in \mathcal{O}\}$. We complete this probabilistic data by C_β -contextual probabilities:

$$D(\mathcal{O}, C) = \{\mathbf{P}(a = \alpha/C), \mathbf{P}(b = \beta/C), \dots, \mathbf{P}(a = \alpha/C_\beta), \mathbf{P}(b = \beta/C_\alpha), \dots\},$$

where $a, b, \dots \in \mathcal{O}$. We denote the collection of probabilistic data $D(\mathcal{O}, C)$ for all contexts $C \in \mathcal{C}$ by the symbol $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{C})$.¹²

Definition 2.1. *A contextual statistical model of reality is a triple*

$$M = (\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{C})) \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ is a set of contexts and $\mathcal{O}$ is a set of observables which satisfy to axioms 1, 2, and $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{C})$ is probabilistic data about contexts $\mathcal{C}$ obtained with the aid of observables $\mathcal{O}$.

We call observables belonging to the set $\mathcal{O} \equiv \mathcal{O}(M)$ *reference of observables*. Inside of a model M observables belonging to the set $\mathcal{O}$ give the only possible references about a context $C \in \mathcal{C}$.

¹²We remark that $D(\mathcal{O}, C)$ does not contain the simultaneous probability distribution of observables $a, b \in \mathcal{O}$ (under the context C). Data $D(\mathcal{O}, C)$ gives a probabilistic image of the context C through the system of observables $\mathcal{O}$. There is defined the map: $\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{C})$, $\pi(C) = D(\mathcal{O}, C)$. In general this map is not one-to-one. Thus the π -image of contextual reality is very rough: *not all contexts can be distinguished with the aid of probabilistic data produced by the class of observables $\mathcal{O}$.*

Definition 2.3. *Reference observables are said to be mutually incompatible if*

$$p^{a/b}(\alpha/\beta) \neq 0, \alpha \in X_a, \beta \in X_b, \quad (2)$$

for any pair $a, b \in \mathcal{O}$.

We shall see that in the case $\mathcal{O} = \{a, b\}$, where observables a and b are incompatible, a contextual statistical model can be projected to the complex Hilbert space. Our model can be completed by the realist interpretation of reference observables $a \in \mathcal{O}$. By the Văxjö interpretation reference observables are interpreted as *properties of contexts*:

“If an observation of a under a complex of physical conditions $C \in \mathcal{C}$ gives the result $a = \alpha$, then this value is interpreted as the objective property of the context C (at the moment of the observation).”

2.2 Systems, ensemble representation

We now complete the contextual statistical model by considering systems ω (e.g., physical or cognitive, or social,..), cf. Ballentine (2001). In our approach systems as well as contexts are considered as *elements of reality*. In our model a context $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is represented by an ensemble S_C of systems which have been interacted with C . For such systems we shall use notation: $\omega \leftarrow C$ The set of all (e.g., physical or cognitive, or social) systems which are used to represent all contexts $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is denoted by the symbol $\Omega \equiv \Omega(\mathcal{C})$. Thus we have a map:

$$C \rightarrow S_C = \{\omega \in \Omega : \omega \leftarrow C\}. \quad (3)$$

This is the ensemble representation of contexts. We set

$$\mathcal{S} \equiv \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C}) = \{S : S = S_C, C \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

This is the collection of all ensembles representing contexts belonging to $\mathcal{C}$. The ensemble representation of contexts is given by the map (3)

$$I : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$$

Reference observables $\mathcal{O}$ are now interpreted as observables on systems $\omega \in \Omega$. In our approach it is not forbidden to interpret the values of the *reference observables* as objective properties of systems.¹³

¹³These objective properties coexist in nature and they can be related to individual systems $\omega \in \Omega$. However, the probabilistic description is possible only with respect to a

Definition 2.2. *The ensemble representation of a contextual statistical model $M = (\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{C}))$ is a triple*

$$S(M) = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{C})) \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{S}$ is a set of ensembles of systems representing contexts $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{O}$ is a set of observables, and $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{C})$ is probabilistic data about ensembles $\mathcal{S}$ obtained with the aid of observables $\mathcal{O}$.

2.3 Applications of Văxjö model in cognitive science, psychology, sociology

Our contextualist statistical realistic models can be used not only in physics, but in any domain of natural and social sciences. Besides of complexes of physical conditions, we can consider complexes of biological, cognitive, social, economic,... conditions – contexts – as elements of reality. Such elements of reality are represented by probabilistic data obtained with the aid of reference observables (biological, mental, social, economic,...).

In the same way as in physics in some special cases it is possible to encode such data by complex amplitudes. In this way we obtain representations of some biological, cognitive, social, economic,... models in complex Hilbert spaces. We call them *complex quantum-like models*. These models describe the usual cos-interference of probabilities. We recall again that such a representation is based on a generalized formula of total probability having the interference term, see section 3.

fixed context C . Noncontextual probabilities have no meaning. So values $a(\omega)$ and $b(\omega)$ coexist for a single system $\omega \in \Omega$, but in general noncontextual (“absolute”) probabilities $\mathbf{P}(\omega \in \Omega : a(\omega) = y), \dots$ are not defined. Thus, instead of mutual exclusivity of observables (cf. Bohr’s principle of complementarity), we consider contextuality of probabilities and “supplementarity” of the reference observables (in the sense that they give supplementary statistical information about contexts). In particular, we can speak about “supplementarity of minds.” Such a supplementarity does not imply mutual exclusivity of minds; they just complete each other. It might be better to change terminology and speak about supplementarity of mental reference observables and not incompatibility.

3 Test of quantum-like structure of mental statistics

3.1 Cognitive and social contexts

We consider examples of cognitive contexts:

1). C can be some selection procedure which is used to select a special group S_C of people or animals. Such a context is represented by this group S_C (so this is an ensemble of cognitive systems). For example, we select a group $S_{\text{prof.math.}}$ of professors of mathematics (and then ask questions a or (and) b or give corresponding tasks). We can select a group of people of some age. We can select a group of people having a “special mental state”: for example, people in love or hungry people (and then ask questions or give tasks).

2). C can be a learning procedure which is used to create some special group of people or animals. For example, rats can be trained to react to special stimulus.

3). C can be a collection of painting, C_{painting} , (e.g. the collection of Hermitage in Sankt-Peterburg) and people interact with C_{painting} by looking at pictures (and then there are asked questions about this collection to those people).

4). C can be, for example, “context of classical music”, $C_{\text{cl.mus.}}$, and people interact with $C_{\text{cl.mus.}}$ by listening in to this music. In principle, we need not use an ensemble of different people. It can be one person whom we ask questions each time after he has listened in to CD (or radio) with classical music. In the latter case we should use not ensemble, but frequency (von Mises) definition of probability.

The last example is an important illustration why from the beginning we prefer to start with the general contextualist ideology and only then we consider the possibility to represent contexts by ensembles of systems. A cognitive context should not be identified with an ensemble of cognitive systems representing this context. For us $C_{\text{cl.mus.}}$ is by itself an element of reality.

We can also consider *social contexts*. For example, social classes: proletariat-context, bourgeois-context; or war-context, revolution-context, context of economic depression, poverty-context and so on. Thus our model can be used in social and political sciences (and even in history). We can try to find quantum-like statistical data in these sciences.

3.2 Observables

We describe mental interference experiment.

Let $a = x_1, x_2$ and $b = y_1, y_2$ be two dichotomous mental observables: $x_1 = \text{'yes'}$, $x_2 = \text{'no'}$, $y_1 = \text{'yes'}$, $y_2 = \text{'no'}$. We set $X \equiv X_a = \{x_1, x_2\}$, $Y \equiv X_b = \{y_1, y_2\}$ (“spectra” of observables a and b). Observables can be two different questions or two different types of cognitive tasks. We use these two fixed reference observables for probabilistic representation of cognitive contextual reality given by C .¹⁴

3.3 Quantum-like structure of experimental mental data

We perform observations of a under the complex of cognitive conditions C :

$$p^a(x) = \frac{\text{the number of results } a = x}{\text{the total number of observations}}, \quad x \in X.$$

So $p^a(x)$ is the probability to get the result x for observation of the a under the complex of cognitive conditions C . In the same way we find probabilities $p^b(y)$ for the b -observation under the same cognitive context C .¹⁵

As was supposed in section 2.1 (Axiom 1), there can be created cognitive contexts C_y corresponding to selections with respect to fixed values of the b -observable. The context C_y (for fixed $y \in Y$) can be characterized in the following way. By measuring the b -observable under the cognitive context

¹⁴Of course, by choosing another set of reference observables in general we shall obtain another representation of cognitive contextual reality. Can we find two fundamental mental observables? It is a very hard question. In physics everything is clear: the position and momentum give us the fundamental pair of reference observables. Which mental observables can be chosen as mental analogous of the position and momentum? In some approaches to the quantum mechanics (e.g. in Bohmian mechanics) position is considered as a fundamental observable, see De Broglie (1964) and D. Bohm (1951); momentum is defined as the conjugate variable. Thus we are looking for a mental analog of position, mental position.

¹⁵Probabilities can be ensemble probabilities or they can be time averages for measurements over one concrete person (e.g., each time after listening in to classical music). Measurements can be even *self-measurements*. For example, I can ask myself questions a or b each time when I fall in love. These should be “hard questions” (incompatible questions). By giving, e.g., the answer $a = \text{'yes'}$, I should make some important decision. It will play an important role when I shall answer to the subsequent question b and vice versa.

C_y we shall obtain the answer $b = y$ with probability one. We perform now the a -measurements under cognitive contexts C_y for $y = y_1, y_2$, and find the probabilities:

$$p^{a/b}(x/y) = \frac{\text{the number of the result } a = x \text{ under context } C_y}{\text{the total number of observations under context } C_y}, \quad x \in X, y \in Y.$$

For example, by using the ensemble approach to probability we have that the probability $p^{a/b}(x_1/y_2)$ is obtained as the frequency of the answer $a = x_1 = \text{'yes'}$ in the ensemble of cognitive system that have already answered $b = y_2 = \text{'no'}$. Thus we first select a subensemble of cognitive systems who replies 'no' to the b -question, $C_{b=no}$. Then we ask systems belonging to $C_{b=no}$ the a -question.

It is assumed (and this is a very natural assumption) that a cognitive system is “responsible for her (his) answers.” Suppose that a system τ has answered $b = y_2 = \text{'no'}$. If we ask τ again the same question b we shall get the same answer $b = y_2 = \text{'no'}$. This is nothing else than the mental form of the von Neumann projection postulate, see von Neumann (1955): the second measurement of the same observable, performed immediately after the first one, will yield the same value of the observable (also Dirac (1933)); see section 3.4 for details.

The classical probability theory tells us that all these probabilities have to be connected by the so called *formula of total probability*, see, e.g. Shirayev (1991):

$$p^a(x) = p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1) + p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2), \quad x \in X.$$

However, if the theory is quantum-like, then we should obtain Khrennikov (2001, 2002, 2003) the formula of total probability with an interference term:

$$\begin{aligned} p^a(x) = & p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1) + p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2) \\ & + 2\lambda(a = x/b, C)\sqrt{p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1)p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the coefficient of incompatibility (the coefficient of interference) is given by

$$\lambda(a = x/b, C) = \frac{p^a(x) - p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1) - p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2)}{2\sqrt{p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1)p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2)}} \quad (6)$$

This formula holds true for *incompatible observables*. To prove its validity, it is sufficient to put the expression for $\lambda(a = x/b, C)$, see (6), into (5).

In the quantum-like statistical test for a cognitive context C we calculate

$$\lambda(a = x/b, C) = \frac{p^a(x) - p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1) - p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2)}{2\sqrt{p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1)p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2)}}.$$

An empirical situation with $\lambda(a = x/b, C) \neq 0$ would yield evidence for quantum-like behaviour of cognitive systems. In this case, starting with (experimentally calculated) coefficient of interference $\lambda(a = x/b, C)$ we can proceed either to the conventional Hilbert space formalism (if this coefficient is bounded by 1) or to so called hyperbolic Hilbert space formalism (if this coefficient is larger than 1). In the first case the coefficient of interference can be represented in the trigonometric form

$$\lambda(a = x/b, C) = \cos \theta(x),$$

Here $\theta(x) \equiv \theta(a = x/b, C)$ is the phase of the a -interference between cognitive contexts C and $C_y, y \in Y$. In this case we have the conventional formula of total probability with the interference term:

$$\begin{aligned} p^a(x) &= p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1) + p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2) \\ &+ 2 \cos \theta(x) \sqrt{p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1)p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In principle, it could be derived in the conventional Hilbert space formalism. But we chosen the inverse way. Starting with (7) we could introduce a “mental wave function” $\psi \equiv \psi_C$ (or pure quantum-like mental state) belonging to this Hilbert space, see section 5. We recall that in our approach a ‘mental wave function’ ψ describes cognitive context C . This is nothing else than a special mathematical encoding of probabilistic information about this context which can be obtained with the aid of reference observables a and b .

3.4 Von Neumann postulate in cognitive science and psychology

For further considerations (on a wave function) it is important to underline that in general all above quantities can depend on a cognitive context C :

$$p^a(x) = p_C^a(x), p^b(y) = p_C^b(y), p^{a/b}(x/y) = p_C^{a/b}(x/y), \theta(x) = \theta_C^{a/b}(x).$$

Dependence of probabilities $p_C^a(x), p_C^b(y)$ on a context C is irreducible (these probabilities are defined by C). But in some cases dependence of the transition probabilities $p_C^{a/b}(x/y)$ on C could be reducible. In the experimental situation these probabilities (frequencies) are found in the following way. First cognitive systems interact with a context C . In this way there is created an ensemble S_C of cognitive systems representing the context C . Then cognitive systems belonging to the ensemble S_C interact with a new context C_y which is determined by the mental observable b . For example, students belonging to a group S_C (which was trained under the mental or social conditions C) should answer to the question b . If this question is so disturbing for a student ω that he would totally forget about the previous C -training, then the transition probabilities do not depend on C : $p^{a/b}(x/y)$.

We remark that this is the case in conventional quantum theory. Here for incompatible (noncommutative) observables the transition probabilities $p^{a/b}(x/y)$ do not depend on the previous context C , i.e., a context preceding the $b = y$ filtration. In quantum theory any $b = y$ filtration destroys the memory on the preceding physical context C . This is our contextual interpretation of the von Neumann projection postulate.

We do not know the general situation for cognitive systems.¹⁶ Our conjecture is that:

Postulate. (“von Neumann postulate for mental observable”) *For any pair a, b of incompatible mental observables the transition probability $p^{a/b}(x/y)$ is completely determined by the preceding preparation – context C_y corresponding to the $[b = y]$ -filtration.*

In principle, we could be satisfied even by a weaker form of this postulate.

Postulate. (“Weak von Neumann postulate for mental observable”) *There exist incompatible mental observables a, b such that the transition probability $p^{a/b}(x/y)$ is completely determined by the preceding preparation – context C_y corresponding to the $[b = y]$ -filtration.*

Finally, we remark that in our contextual approach the von Neumann postulate (for physical as well as mental systems) is not so mysterious. This is nothing else as the condition of Markovness for successive measurements.

¹⁶It might be that the von Neumann projection postulate can be violated by cognitive systems. In such a case we would not be able to construct the conventional quantum representation of contexts by complex probability amplitudes, cf. section 5.

4 Hyperbolic interference of minds

As was already mentioned, statistical data obtained in experiments with cognitive systems could produce the coefficient of interference which is larger than 1. In general quantities

$$\lambda(a = x/b, C) = \frac{p^a(x) - p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1) - p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2)}{2\sqrt{p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1)p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2)}}.$$

can extend 1 (see Khrennikov (2001, 2002, 2003) for examples). In this case we can introduce a hyperbolic phase parameter $\theta \in [0, \infty)$ such that

$$\cosh \theta(x) = \pm \frac{p^a(x) - p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1) - p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2)}{2\sqrt{p^b(y_1)p^{a/b}(x/y_1)p^b(y_2)p^{a/b}(x/y_2)}}.$$

In this case we can not proceed to the ordinary Hilbert space formalism. Nevertheless, we can use an analog of the complex Hilbert space representation for probabilities. Probabilities corresponding such cognitive contexts can be represented in a hyperbolic Hilbert space – module over a two-dimensional Clifford algebra, see Khrennikov (2001, 2002, 2003).¹⁷

In principle it may occur that $|\lambda_1| \leq 1$ and $|\lambda_2| > 1$ or vice versa. In this case we obtain *hyper-trigonometric interference* of minds.

5 Mental wave function

Let C be a cognitive context. We consider only cognitive contexts with trigonometric interference for *incompatible mental observables* a and b . It is assumed that the Weak von Neumann postulate for mental observable holds for a and b . The interference formula of total probability (5) can be written in the following form:

$$p_C^a(x) = \sum_{y \in Y} p_C^b(y)p^{a/b}(x/y) + 2 \cos \theta_C(x) \sqrt{\prod_{y \in Y} p_C^b(y)p^{a/b}(x/y)} \quad (8)$$

By using the elementary formula:

$$D = A + B + 2\sqrt{AB} \cos \theta = |\sqrt{A} + e^{i\theta} \sqrt{B}|^2, A, B > 0,$$

¹⁷At the moment there are no experimental confirmations of hyperbolic interference for cognitive systems. If such a result was obtained it would imply that cognitive systems have more rich probabilistic structure than quantum systems.

we can represent the probability $p_C^b(x)$ as the square of the complex amplitude:

$$p_C^a(x) = |\psi_C(x)|^2 \quad (9)$$

where

$$\psi(x) \equiv \psi_C(x) = \sum_{y \in Y} \sqrt{p_C^b(y)p^{a/b}(x/y)} e^{i\xi_C(x/y)}. \quad (10)$$

Here phases $\xi_C(x/y)$ are such that

$$\xi_C(x/y_1) - \xi_C(x/y_2) = \theta_C(x).$$

We denote the space of functions: $\psi : X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ by the symbol $E = \Phi(X, \mathbf{C})$. Since $X = \{x_1, x_2\}$, the E is the two dimensional complex linear space. Dirac's δ -functions $\{\delta(x_1 - x), \delta(x_2 - x)\}$ form the canonical basis in this space. For each $\psi \in E$ we have

$$\psi(x) = \psi(x_1)\delta(x_1 - x) + \psi(x_2)\delta(x_2 - x).$$

Denote by the symbol $\mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}}$ the set of all cognitive contexts having the trigonometric statistical behaviour (i.e., $|\lambda| \leq 1$) with respect to mental observables a and b . By using the representation (10) we construct the map

$$\tilde{J}^{a/b} : \mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}} \rightarrow \tilde{\Phi}(X, \mathbf{C}),$$

where $\tilde{\Phi}(X, \mathbf{C})$ is the space of equivalent classes of functions under the equivalence relation: φ equivalent ψ iff $\varphi = t\psi, t \in \mathbf{C}, |t| = 1$.

To fix some concrete representation of a context C , we can choose, e.g., $\xi_C(x/y_1) = 0$ and $\xi_C(x/y_2) = \theta_C(x)$. Thus we construct the map

$$J^{a/b} : \mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}} \rightarrow \Phi(X, \mathbf{C}) \quad (11)$$

The $J^{a/b}$ maps cognitive contexts into complex amplitudes. The representation (9) of probability as the square of the absolute value of the complex (a/b) -amplitude is nothing other than the famous **Born rule**. The complex amplitude ψ_C can be called a *mental wave function* or pure mental state (QL-state).

We emphasize that the map $J^{a/b}$ is not surjective. It can happen that $J^{a/b}(C_1) = J^{a/b}(C_2)$ for different context C_1 and C_2 (if $p_{C_1}^a(x) = p_{C_2}^a(x)$ and $p_{C_1}^b(y) = p_{C_2}^b(y)$). Such contexts are represented by the same complex amplitude $\psi(x) = \psi_{C_1}(x) = \psi_{C_2}(x)$. In particular, it can be that different

cognitive contexts are represented by the same mental wave function ψ . We shall come back to this problem in section 6. We set

$$e_x^a(\cdot) = \delta(x - \cdot)$$

The representation (9) can be rewritten in the following form:

$$p_C^a(x) = |(\psi_C, e_x^a)|^2, \quad (12)$$

where the scalar product in the space $E = \Phi(X, C)$ is defined by the standard formula:

$$(\varphi, \psi) = \sum_{x \in X} \varphi(x) \bar{\psi}(x).$$

The system of functions $\{e_x^a\}_{x \in X}$ is an orthonormal basis in the Hilbert space $H = (E, (\cdot, \cdot))$

Let $X \subset \mathbf{R}$, where $\mathbf{R}$ is the set of real numbers. By using the Hilbert space representation of Born's rule (12) we obtain for the Hilbert space representation of the classical conditional expectation:

$$E(a/C) = \sum_{x \in X} x p^a(x) = \sum_{x \in X} x |\psi_C(x)|^2 = (\hat{a} \psi_C, \psi_C), \quad (13)$$

where $\hat{a} : \Phi(X, \mathbf{C}) \rightarrow \Phi(X, \mathbf{C})$ is the multiplication operator. This operator can also be determined by its eigenvectors: $\hat{a} e_x^a = x e_x^a, x \in X$.

We notice that if the matrix of transition probabilities $P^{a/b} = (p^{a/b}(x/y))$ is *double stochastic* we can represent the mental observable b by a symmetric operator $\hat{b}$ in the same Hilbert space. In general operators $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{b}$ do not commute, Khrennikov (2003).

6 Quantum-like projection of mental reality

We emphasize that the quantum-like representation is created through a projection of underlying mental realistic model to the complex Hilbert space. Such a projection induces a huge loss of information about the underlying mental model. Thus the quantum-like model gives a very rough image of the realistic model.

6.1 Social opinion pull

Let us consider a family of social contexts $\mathcal{C}$ such that each context correspond to society of some country: $C_{\text{USA}}, C_{\text{GB}}, C_{\text{FR}}, \dots, C_{\text{GER}}, \dots$ and let us consider two reference observables given by questions:

- a). “Are you against pollution?”
- b). “Would you want to have lower prices for gasoline?”

It is supposed that observables a and b are incompatible:

$$p^{a/b}(a = \text{yes}/b = \text{no}) \neq 0, p^{a/b}(a = \text{no}/b = \text{no}) \neq 0,$$

$$p^{a/b}(a = \text{yes}/b = \text{yes}) \neq 0, p^{a/b}(a = \text{no}/b = \text{yes}) \neq 0.$$

Thus the corresponding social groups in the society are assumed to be statistically essential. Moreover, to get a quantum-like representation it should be assumed that the transition probabilities $p^{a/b}(a = x/b = y)$ do not depend on a society C . For example, the proportion of people who are against pollution among people who are satisfied by prices for gasoline is the same in USA, Great Britain, France and so on. Of course, this is a rather strong assumption. And its validity should be checked.

The pull under consideration contains very important questions. In our QL-model in those societies are represented by complex probability amplitudes

$$\psi_{\text{USA}}, \psi_{\text{GB}}, \psi_{\text{FR}}, \dots, \psi_{\text{GER}}, \dots$$

These mental wave functions can be used to investigate some essential features of these societies. But, of course, answers to the questions a and b do not completely characterize a society. Thus the quantum-like representation induces the huge loss of information.

6.2 Quantum-like representation of functioning of neuronal structures

Let us consider two coupled neural networks N_1 and N_2 . We assume that they are strictly hierarchic in the sense that there are “grandmother” neurons n_1 and n_2 in networks N_1 and N_2 , respectively.¹⁸ The integral network

¹⁸The model of cognition based on grandmother neurons was dominating in 60 – 80th, Amit (1989) . Later it was strongly criticized, but was not totally rejected. In the modified approach there are considered grandmother neuronal groups, instead of single neurons.

$N = N_1 + N_2$ interacts with contexts C which are given by input signals into both networks. For example, contexts $\mathcal{C} = \{C\}$ can be visual images and the integral network N recognizes those images (e.g. N_1 is responsible for contours and N_2 for colors). We use so called frequency-domain approach, see for example Hoppenstead (1997), and assume that cognitive information is presented by frequencies of firing of neurons. Consider two reference observables a, b where $a = 1 : n_1$ firing, and $a = 0 : n_1$ –nonfiring, and $b = 1 : n_2$ –firing, and $b = 0 : n_2$ –nonfiring. Our quantum-like formalism gives the possibility to represent each context C (e.g., an image C) by a complex probability amplitude ψ_C . Here probabilities $\mathbf{P}(a = x/C), \mathbf{P}(b = y/C)$ are defined as frequencies. Such an amplitude can be reconstructed on the basis of measurements on grandmother neurons n_1 and n_2 . Of course, ψ_C gives only a projection of the neuronal image of the context C . The complete neuronal image is given by frequencies of firing of all neurons in the network N and the QL-image ψ_C is based only on frequencies of firings of grandmother neurons. However, we could not exclude that cognition (and consciousness) is really based on such a QL-projecting of neuronal states, see section 7.

6.3 Quantum-like representation of Freud’s psychoanalysis

In its original form Freud’s psychoanalysis was based on the representation of psychical states of patients through two groups of questions:

- a : about recollections from childhood;
- b : about sexual experiences.

Later Sigmund Freud was criticized for his attempt to reduce the psychical state to the a, b -domains. He was especially strongly criticized for overestimating the role of sexual experiences in childhood. From our point of view Freud’s approach might be considered as the basis for creation of a quantum-like representation based on the reference observables a and b . Of course, a mental ψ -function based on observables a and b gives a very rough representation of the underlying mental context of a patient, but nevertheless it could be used to proceed mathematically.

7 Quantum-like consciousness

The brain is a huge information systems which contains millions of minds. It could not “recognize” (or “feel”) all those minds at each instant of time t .¹⁹ Our fundamental hypothesis is that the brain is able to create the QL-representations of minds. At each instant of time t the brain creates the QL-representation of its mental context C based on two incompatible²⁰ mental (self-)observables a and b . Here $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ can be very long vectors of compatible dichotomous observables. The (self-)reference observables can be chosen (by the brain) in different ways at different instances of time. Such a change of the reference observables is known in cognitive sciences as a *change of representation*.

A mental context C in the a/b -representation is described by the mental wave function ψ_C . We can speculate that the brain has the ability to feel this mental field as a distribution on the space X . This distribution is given by the norm-squared of the mental wave function: $|\psi_C(x)|^2$. This mental QL-wave contributes into the deterministic dynamics of minds, e.g. by inducing Bohmian quantum potential, see e.g. Khrennikov (2000).

In such a model it might be supposed that the state of our consciousness is represented by the mental wave function ψ_C . By using Freud’s terminology we can say that one has classical *subconsciousness* and quantum-like consciousness, cf. Khrennikov (2000). QL-consciousness is represented by the mental wave function ψ_C . The crucial point is that in this model consciousness is created through neglecting an essential volume of information contained in subconsciousness. Of course, this is not just a random loss of information. Information is selected through the algorithm presented in section 5: context C is projected onto ψ_C .

The (classical) mental state of subconsciousness evolves with time $C \rightarrow C(t)$. This dynamics induces dynamics of the mental wave function $\psi(t) = \psi_{C(t)}$ in the complex Hilbert space, see Khrennikov (2004) for the mathemat-

¹⁹It may be more natural to consider mental (or psychological) time and not physical time, see e.g. Khrennikov (2000). There are experimental evidences that: a) cognition is not based on the continuous time processes (a moment in mental time correlates with $\Delta \approx 100ms$ of physical time); b) different psychological functions operate on different scales of physical time. In Khrennikov (2000) mental time was described mathematically by using p -adic hierarchic trees.

²⁰As was mentioned in footnote 14, see section 2.2, it is more natural to call a and b supplementary and incompatible.

ical details.

Postulate QLR. *The brain is able to create the QL-representation of mental contexts, $C \rightarrow \psi_C$ (by using the algorithm based on the formula of total probability with interference, see section 5).*

8 Brain as quantum-like computer

We can speculate that the ability of the brain to create the QL-representation of mental contexts, see Postulate QLR, induces functioning of the brain as a quantum-like computer.

Postulate QLC. *The brain performs computation-thinking by using algorithms of quantum computing in the complex Hilbert space of mental QL-states.*

We emphasize that in our approach the brain is not quantum computer, but QL-computer. On one hand, QL-computer works totally in accordance with mathematical theory of quantum computations (so by using quantum algorithms). On the other hand, it is not based on superposition of individual mental states. The complex amplitude ψ_C representing a mental context C is a special probabilistic representation of information states of the huge neuronal ensemble. In particular, the brain is *macroscopic* QL-computer. Thus the QL-parallelism (in the opposite to conventional quantum parallelism) has a natural realistic base. This is real parallelism in working of millions of neurons. The crucial point is the way in which this classical parallelism is projected onto dynamics of QL-states. The QL-brain is able to solve NP-problems. But there is nothing mysterious in this ability: exponentially increasing number of operations is performed through involving of exponentially increasing number of neurons.

We pay attention that by coupling QL-parallelism to working of neurons we started to present a particular ontic model for QL-computations. We shall discuss it in more detail. Observables a and b are self-observations of brain. They can be represented as functions of the internal state of brain ω . Here ω is a parameter of huge dimension describing states of all neurons in brain: $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_N)$:

$$a = a(\omega), b = b(\omega).$$

The brain is not interested in concrete values of the reference observables at fixed instances of time. The brain finds the contextual probability distributions $p_C^a(x)$ and $p_C^b(y)$ and creates the mental QL-state $\psi_C(x)$, see algorithm in section 5. Then it works with $\psi_C(x)$ by using algorithms of quantum computing. The crucial problem is to find mechanism of calculating of contextual probabilities. We think that they are frequency probabilities which are created in the brain in the following way.

There are two scales of time: a) internal scale; b) QL-scale. The internal scale is finer than the QL-scale. Each instant of QL-time t corresponds to an interval Δ of internal time τ . We might identify the QL-time with mental (psychological) time and the internal time with physical time. During the interval Δ of internal time the brain collects statistical data for self-observations of a and b .

Thus the internal state ω of the brain evolves as $\omega = \omega(\tau, \omega_0)$. At each instance of internal time τ there are performed nondisturbative self-measurements of a and b . These are realistic measurements: the brain gets values $a(\omega(\tau, \omega_0))$, $b(\omega(\tau, \omega_0))$. By finding frequencies of realization of fixed values for $a(\omega(\tau, \omega_0))$ and $b(\omega(\tau, \omega_0))$ the brain obtains the frequency probabilities $p_C^a(x)$ and $p_C^b(y)$. These probabilities are related to the instant of QL-time time t corresponding to the interval of internal time Δ : $p_C^a(t, x)$ and $p_C^b(t, y)$.

For example, a and b can be measurements over different domains of brain. It is supposed that the brain can “feel” probabilities (frequencies) $p_C^a(x)$ and $p_C^b(y)$, but not able to “feel” the simultaneous probability distribution $p_C(x, y) = P(a = x, b = y/C)$. This is not the problem of mathematical existence of such a distribution.²¹ This is the problem of integration of statistics of observations from different domains of the brain. By using the QL-representation based only on probabilities $p_C^a(x)$ and $p_C^b(y)$ the brain could be able to escape integration of information about *individual self-observations* of variables a and b related to spatially separated domains of brain. The brain need not couple these domains at each instant of internal time τ . It couples them only once in the interval Δ through the contextual probabilities $p_C^a(x)$ and $p_C^b(y)$. This induces the huge saving of time.

²¹We recall that, since we consider only two realistic observables, there is no direct contradiction with Bell’s inequality.

9 Evolution of mental wave function

The mental wave function $\psi(t)$ evolves in the complex Hilbert space (space of probability amplitudes, see section 5). The straightforward generalization of quantum mechanics would imply the *linear* Schrödinger equation:

$$i\frac{d\psi(t)}{dt} = \hat{\mathcal{H}}\psi(t), \psi(0) = \psi_0, \quad (14)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{H}} : H \rightarrow H$ is a self-adjoint operator in the Hilbert space H of mental QL-states. However, the Våxjö model predicts, Khrennikov (2004), broader spectrum of evolutions in the Hilbert space (induced by evolutions of contexts). We could not go deeply into mathematical details and only remark that in general the contextual dynamics $C \rightarrow C(t)$ can induce *nonlinear* evolutions in H :

$$i\frac{d\psi(t)}{dt} = \hat{\mathcal{H}}(\psi(t)), \psi(0) = \psi_0, \quad (15)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{H}} : H \rightarrow H$ is a nonlinear map. It is important to point out that even the nonlinear dynamics in the Hilbert state space induced by a contextual dynamics is *unitary*: $(\psi(t), \psi(t)) = (\psi(0), \psi(0))$.

In principle,

there are no a priori reasons to assume that the mental quantum-like dynamics should always be linear!

It might be that nonlinearity of the Hilbert space dynamics is the distinguishing feature of cognitive systems. However, at the present time this is just a speculation. Therefore it would be interesting to consider a linear mental quantum-like dynamics.²² For example, let us consider a quantum-like Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}} \equiv \mathcal{H}(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) = \frac{\hat{b}^2}{2} + V(\hat{a}), \quad (16)$$

where $V : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a “mental potential” (e.g. a polynomial), cf Khrennikov (1999, 2000, 2003). We call $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ the operator of *mental energy*. Denote by ψ_j stationary mental QL-states: $\hat{\mathcal{H}}\psi_j = \mu_j\psi_j$. Then any mental QL-state ψ can be represented as a superposition of stationary states:

$$\psi = k_1\psi_1 + k_2\psi_2, \quad k_j \in \mathbf{C}, |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2 = 1. \quad (17)$$

²²In any event linear dynamics can be considered as an approximation of nonlinear dynamics.

One might speculate that the brain has the ability to feel superpositions (17) of stationary mental QL-states. In such a case superposition would be an element of mental reality. However, it seems not be the case. Suppose that ψ_1 corresponds to zero mental energy, $\mu_1 = 0$. For example, such a QL-state can be interpreted as the state of depression. Let $\mu_2 \gg 0$. For example, such a QL-state can be interpreted as the state of excitement. My internal mental experience tells that I do not have a feeling of superposition of states of depression and high excitement. If I am not in one of those stationary states, then I am just in a new special mental QL-state ψ and I have the feeling of this ψ and not superposition.²³ Thus it seems that the expansion (17) is just a purely mathematical feature of the model.

10 Noninjectivity of correspondence between classical subconsciousness and quantum-like consciousness

We use here the interpretation proposed in the previous section and pay attention that the map $J^{a/b} : \mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}} \rightarrow \Phi(X, \mathbf{C})$, see section 5, is not one-to-one. Thus it can be that a few different contexts $C, C', ..$ are represented by the same mental QL-state ψ . Suppose now that this is a stationary state – an eigenstate of the operator of mental energy. We pay attention that in general the corresponding mental context is not uniquely determined. QL-stationarity of a state ψ_j can be based on a rather complex dynamics of context, $C_j(t)$, in subconsciousness.

11 Structure the set of states of mental systems

We recall few basic notions of the statistical formalism of quantum theory, see, e.g., Holevo (2001). States of quantum systems are mathematically represented by density operators – positive operators ρ of unit trace. Pure states (wave functions) ψ are represented by vectors belonging to the unit sphere of a Hilbert space – corresponding density operators ρ_ψ are the orthogonal

²³We exclude abnormal behavior such as manic-depressive syndrome.

projectors onto one dimensional subspaces corresponding to vectors ψ . The set $\mathcal{D}$ of states (density operators) is a convex set.

In the two dimensional case (corresponding to dichotomous observables – ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answers) the set $\mathcal{D}$ can be represented as the unit ball in the three dimensional real space $\mathbf{R}^3$. Pure states are represented as the unit sphere, *Bloch sphere*. Here the whole set $\mathcal{D}$ is the convex hall of the Bloch sphere S , i.e., of the set of pure states.

In our mental QL-model some contexts (producing trigonometric interference) are represented by points in S . We can also consider statistical mixtures of these pure states. Let $S_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}}} = J^{a/b}(\mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}})$ (the image of the set of populations $\mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}}$). Then the set of mental states $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}}}$ coincides with the convex hall of the $S_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}}}$. There are no reasons to suppose that $S_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}}}$ would coincide with the Bloch sphere S . Thus there is no reasons to suppose that the set of mental QL-states $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}}}$ would coincide with the set of quantum states $\mathcal{D}$. It is the fundamental problem²⁴ to describe the set of pure quantum-like mental states $S_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}}}$ for various classes of cognitive systems.

We might speculate that $S_{\mathcal{P}}$ depends essentially on a class of cognitive system. So $S_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{human}}$ does not equal to $S_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{leon}}$. We can even speculate that in the process of evolution the set $S_{\mathcal{P}}$ have been increasing and $S_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{human}}$ is the maximal set of mental states. It might even occur that $S_{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{human}}$ coincides with the Bloch sphere.

12 Single-mind, many minds and Vaxjo approaches

As was pointed by Barret (1999), p. 211: “Just as with many-worlds theories, there are many many-minds formulations of quantum mechanics.” It seems that the approach of Albert and Loewer (1988) to the many-minds theory is the most close to our approach. It was created to provide a more natural foundations of Everett’s many-worlds interpretation. One could easier accept the presence of many minds than many worlds. However, we are not so much interested in the original aim of the many-minds approach as a mental interpretation of Everett’s many-worlds quantum mechanics. We are interested on consequences of Albert–Loewer theory for cognitive science. We start with so called single-mind theory, see e.g. Barret (1999) for compact and simple

²⁴Of course, if you would accept our quantum-like statistical ideology.

presentation: “The single-mind theory is a sort of hidden-variable theory, but instead of taking positions as always determinate, one takes mental states as always determinate. ... This explanation of the determinacy of experience requires one to adopt a theory of mind where an observer’s mental state is well defined at an instant.” It is very important for us that “The individual minds, as on the [single-mind theory], are not quantum mechanical systems; they are never in superposition”. Such a viewpoint to individual minds is also characteristic for our contextual realistic mental model: a single mind could not be in a superposition of states; in particular, interference is not a self-interference of a single mind. We remark that the Albert–Loewer and Văxjö approaches differ crucially from quantum logic approach. In the latter a single mind is in a superposition of mental states and mental interference is a self-interference of mind.

Albert and Loewer (1988, 1992) also created a many-minds theory. In this theory, see Albert and Loewer (1988), p.206, 130 and Barrett (1999), p.192, : “ ... every sentient physical system, every observer, is associated with not a single mind but rather a continuous infinity of minds. Each mind is supposed to evolve exactly as described in the single-mind theory; there are just more of them associated with each observer.” This picture does not contradict to our contextual statistical realistic model of mental reality. However, we emphasize again (see introduction for comparison with Bohmian mechanics) that the Văxjö model is just an observational model like the orthodox Copenhagen model.²⁵ Therefore we are not interested in what happens really in the brain (e.g., how those single minds evolve). For us it is important only the presence of ensembles of minds in that each mind has a determinate state.

From the point of view of the many-minds model we do the following thing. Denote the collection of observer’s minds (at some instant) by C . In the Văxjö terminology this is a mental (or cognitive) context. Consider two incompatible mental observables a and b (e.g. given in the form of questions). Then we can construct a mental wave function ψ_C , see section 5, representing the collection of minds C .

Another many-minds interpretation was proposed by Lookwood (1989, 1996). In the debate between Lookwood (1996) and Loewer (1996) we would choose the side of Albert and Loewer. As in the theory of Albert and Loewer (1988), we assume that minds have definite states at each instant. We also assume random dynamics of minds (in subconsciousness, see section 7). There-

²⁵The main difference is that the Văxjö model is realistic (for the reference observables).

fore minds in the Vaxjo model as well as in the Albert–Loewer (1988) model “have reliable memories of their own past mental states,” p. 121. As was pointed by Barret (1999), the latter assumption about memories implies that Lockwood’s belief “that his theory is empirically equivalent to Albert and Loewer’s” was not justified (“since minds on Lookwood’s many-minds theory do not have even transcendental identities,” p.210). Neither our theory could be connected to Lookwood’s theory.²⁶

13 On the notion of macroscopic quantum system

The study of macroscopic quantum systems is the subject of the greatest interest for foundations of quantum mechanics as well as its applications. However, I would like to pay attention to the fact that (at least for me) it is not clear:

“What can be called a macroscopic quantum system?”

Of course, this question is closely related to the old question:

“What can be called a quantum system?”

There is no common point of view to such notions as quantization, quantum theory. For me (in the opposition to N. Bohr) the presence of quanta (of, e.g., energy) is not the main distinguishing feature of quantum theory. Of course, the presence of observables (e.g., energy) with discrete spectra is an important feature of quantum theory. However, the basic quantum observables, the position and the momentum, still have continuous ranges of values. I think that the main point is that quantum theory is a *statistical theory*. Therefore it should be characterized in statistical terms. We should find the basic feature of quantum theory which distinguishes this theory from classical statistical mechanics. The *interference of probabilities* is such a basic statistical feature of quantum theory. Therefore any system (material or not) which exhibits (for some observables) the interference of probabilities should be considered as a quantum system (or say “quantum-like system”). Thus, since human beings by replying to special pairs of questions produce, see

²⁶Here we do not discuss many-minds theory of Donald (1990, 1995, 1996), since his approach is based on the reductionist idea that “quantumness of mind” is a consequence of “quantumness of brain” as a physical system. As was pointed out in introduction, our model could be used neither as an argument for supporting nor rejecting quantum reductionism.

Conte et al. (2004), interference of probabilities, they should be considered as macroscopic quantum systems.²⁷

As I understood, for physicists a macroscopic quantum system is a huge ensemble of microscopic quantum systems (e.g., electrons) prepared in a special state. Human being is also a huge ensemble of microscopic quantum systems... However, the state of this ensemble cannot be considered as quantum from the traditional point of view. Nevertheless, according to our interference viewpoint to quantumness human being is quantum (but not because it is composed of microscopic quantum systems).

In the connection with our discussion on the definition of a macroscopic quantum system it is natural to mention experiments of A. Zeilinger and his collaborators on interference of probabilities for fullerenes and other macromolecules including bimolecular porphyrin. It seems that A. Zeilinger uses the same definition of quantumness as I. It is interesting that one of the main aims of further experiments of A. Zeilinger is to find the interference of probabilities for some viruses. I think that at that point he will come really very close to my viewpoint to macroscopic quantum systems, in particular, biological quantum systems.

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank S. Albeverio, H. Atmanspacher, E. Conte, C. Fuchs, A. Grib, A. Plotnitsky, B. Hiley, A. Holevo, G. Vitiello, G. S. Voronkov for fruitful discussions.

References

- Albert, D. Z., Loewer, B., 1988. Interpreting the many worlds interpretation. *Synthese* 77, 195-213.
- Albert, D. Z., 1992. *Quantum mechanics and experience*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Amit, D., 1989. *Modeling Brain Function*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
- Ashby, R., 1952, *Design of a brain*. Chapman-Hall, London.
- Atmanspacher, H., Biskop, R. C., Amann, A., 2001. Extrinsic and intrinsic irreversibility in probabilistic dynamical laws. *Proc. Conf. Foundations*

²⁷I presented this viewpoint to macroscopic quantum systems in my discussions with A. Leggett (after his public lecture in Prague connected with the Conference "Frontiers of Quantum and Mesoscopic Thermodynamics", Prague, July-2004, and during my talk at University of Illinois). Unfortunately, neither A. Leggett nor other participants of the conference buy my idea on human being as a macroscopic quantum system.

of Probability and Physics, ed. A. Yu. Khrennikov. Q. Prob. White Noise Anal. 13, 50-70, WSP, Singapore.

Atmanspacher, H., Kronz, F., 1999. Relative onticity. In On quanta, mind, and matter. Hans Primas in context. ed. H. Atmanspacher, A. Amann, U. Müller-Herold, 273-294, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Ballentine, L. E., 2001. Interpretations of probability and quantum theory. Proc. Conf. Foundations of Probability and Physics, ed. A. Yu. Khrennikov. Q. Prob. White Noise Anal. 13, 71-84, WSP, Singapore.

Barrett, J. A., 1999. The quantum mechanics of minds and worlds. Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford.

Bechtel, W., Abrahamsen, A., 1991. Connectionism and the mind. Basil Blackwell, Cambridge.

Bohm, D., 1951. Quantum theory. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New-Jersey.

Bohm, D., Hiley, B., 1993. The undivided universe: an ontological interpretation of quantum mechanics. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Choustova, O., 2004. Bohmian mechanics for financial processes. J. Modern Optics 51, n. 6/7, 1111.

Conte, E., Todarello, O., Federici, A., Vitiello, T., Lopane, M., Khrennikov, A. Yu., 2004. A Preliminar Evidence of Quantum Like Behavior in Measurements of Mental States. In Quantum Theory: Reconsideration of Foundations, edited by A. Yu. Khrennikov, Ser. Math. Modeling 10, 679-702, Växjö Univ. Press, Växjö; <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/quant-ph/0307201>.

De Broglie, L., 1964. The current interpretation of wave mechanics, critical study. Elsevier Publ., Amsterdam-London-New York.

Dirac, P. A. M., 1930. The Principles of Quantum Mechanics. Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford.

Donald, M. J., 1996. On many-minds interpretation of quantum mechanics. Preprint.

Donald, M. J., 1990. Quantum theory and brain. Proc. Royal Soc. A 427, 43-93.

Donald, M. J., 1995. A mathematical characterization of the physical structure of observers. Found. Physics 25/4, 529-571.

Deutsch, D., 1997. The Fabric of Reality. How much can our four deepest theories of the world explain? Publisher Allen Lane, The Penguin Press.

Eliasmith, C., 1996. The third contender: a critical examination of the dynamicist theory of cognition. Phil. Psychology 9(4), 441-463.

Fuchs, C., 2002. Quantum mechanics as quantum information (and only a little more). Proc. Conf. Quantum Theory: Reconsideration of Foundations, ed. A. Yu. Khrennikov. Ser. Math. Modelling 2, 463-543, Växjö Univ. Press, Växjö.

Fuchs, C., 2002. The anti-Växjö interpretation of quantum mechanics. Proc. Int. Conf. Quantum Theory: Reconsideration of Foundations. ed. A. Yu. Khrennikov, Ser. Math. Modelling 2, 99-116, Växjö Univ. Press, Växjö; <http://www.msi.vxu.se/forskn/quantum.pdf>

Gudder, S. P., 2001. An approach to quantum probability. Proc. Conf. Foundations of Probability and Physics, ed. A. Yu. Khrennikov. Q. Prob. White Noise Anal. 13, 147-160, WSP, Singapore.

Hameroff, S., 1994. Quantum coherence in microtubules. A neural basis for emergent consciousness? J. of Consciousness Studies, 1, 91-118.

Hameroff, S., 1998. Quantum computing in brain microtubules? The Penrose-Hameroff Orch Or model of consciousness. Phil. Tr. Royal Sc., London A, 1-28.

Healey, R., 1984. How many worlds? Nous 18, 591-616.

Hiley, B., Pylkkänen, P., 1997. Active information and cognitive science – A reply to Kieseppä. In: Brain, mind and physics. Editors: Pylkkänen, P., Pylkkö, P., Hautamäki, A. IOS Press, Amsterdam.

Hiley, B., 2000. Non-commutative geometry, the Bohm interpretation and the mind-matter relationship. Proc. CASYS 2000, Liege, Belgium.

Holevo, A. S., 2001. Statistical structure of quantum theory. Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg.

Hopfield, J. J., 1982. Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 79, 1554-2558.

Hoppensteadt, F. C., 1997. An introduction to the mathematics of neurons: modeling in the frequency domain. Cambridge Univ. Press, New York.

Jibu, M., Yasue, K., 1992. A physical picture of Umezawa's quantum brain dynamics. In Cybernetics and Systems Research, ed. R. Trappl, World Sc., London.

Jibu, M., Yasue, K., 1994. Quantum brain dynamics and consciousness. J. Benjamins Publ. Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Khrennikov, A. Yu., 1999. Classical and quantum mechanics on information spaces with applications to cognitive, psychological, social and anomalous phenomena. Found. Phys. 29, 1065-1098.

- Khrennikov, A. Yu., 2000. Classical and quantum mechanics on p -adic trees of ideas. *BioSystems* 56, 95-120.
- Khrennikov, A. Yu., 2002. On foundations of quantum theory. *Proc. Conf. Quantum Theory: Reconsideration of Foundations*, ed. A. Yu. Khrennikov. Ser. Math. Modelling 2, 163-196, Växjö Univ. Press, Växjö.
- Khrennikov, A. Yu., 2002. Växjö interpretation of quantum mechanics, <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/quant-ph/0202107>.
- Khrennikov, A. Yu., 2001. Linear representations of probabilistic transformations induced by context transitions. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 34, 9965-9981.
- Khrennikov, A. Yu., 2003. Contextual viewpoint to quantum stochastics. *J. Math. Phys.* 44, N. 6, 2471- 2478.
- Khrennikov, A. Yu., 2003. Representation of the Kolmogorov model having all distinguishing features of quantum probabilistic model. *Phys. Lett. A* 316, 279-296.
- Khrennikov, A. Yu., 2002. On cognitive experiments to test quantum-like behaviour of mind. *Rep. Växjö Univ.: Math. Nat. Sc. Tech.*, N 7; <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/quant-ph/0205092>.
- Khrennikov, A. Yu., 2003. Hyperbolic quantum mechanics. *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras* 13(1), 1-9.
- Khrennikov, A. Yu., 2003. Interference of probabilities and number field structure of quantum models. *Annalen der Physik* 12, N. 10, 575-585.
- Khrennikov, A. Yu., 2003. Quantum-like formalism for cognitive measurements. *Biosystems* 70, 211-233.
- Khrennikov, A. Yu., 2003. Schrödinger dynamics as the Hilbert space projection of a realistic contextual probabilistic dynamics. *Europhysics Letters*, accepted to publication; <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/quant-ph/0409128>.
- Lockwood, M., 1989. *Mind, Brain and Quantum*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Lockwood, M., 1996. Many minds interpretations of quantum mechanics. *British J. for the Philosophy of Sc.* 47/2, 159-88.
- Loewer, B., 1996. Comment on Lockwood. *British J. for the Philosophy of Sc.* 47/2, 229-232.
- Mackey, G. W., 1963. *Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics*. W. A. Benjamin INC, New York.
- Orlov, Y. F., 1982. The wave logic of consciousness: A hypothesis. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* 21, N 1, 37-53.
- Plotnitsky, A., 2002. Quantum atomicity and quantum information: Bohr, Heisenberg, and quantum mechanics as an information theory, *Proc.*

Conf. Quantum theory: reconsideration of foundations, ed: A. Yu. Khrennikov, Ser. Math. Modelling 2, 309-343, Växjö Univ. Press, Växjö.

Plotnitsky, A., 2001. Reading Bohr: Complementarity, Epistemology, Entanglement, and Decoherence. Proc. NATO Workshop Decoherence and its Implications for Quantum Computations, Eds. A.Gonis and P.Turchi, p.3–37, IOS Press, Amsterdam.

Plotnitsky, A., 2002. The spirit and the letter of Copenhagen: a response to Andrei Khrennikov, <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/quant-ph/0206026>.

Penrose, R., 1989. The emperor's new mind. Oxford Univ. Press, New-York.

Penrose, R., 1994. Shadows of the mind. Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford.

Shiryayev, A. N., 1991. Probability. Springer, Heidelberg.

Stapp, H. P., 1993. Mind, matter and quantum mechanics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York-Heidelberg.

Strogatz, S. H., 1994. Nonlinear dynamics and chaos with applications to physics, biology, chemistry, and engineering. Addison Wesley, Reading, Mass.

van Gelder, T., Port, R., 1995. It's about time: Overview of the dynamical approach to cognition. in Mind as motion: Explorations in the dynamics of cognition. Ed.: T. van Gelder, R. Port. MITP, Cambridge, Mass, 1-43.

van Gelder, T., 1995. What might cognition be, if not computation? J. of Philosophy 91, 345-381.

Vitiello, G., 2001. My double unveiled - the dissipative quantum model of brain. J. Benjamins Publ. Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

von Neumann, J., 1955. Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J..

Whitehead, A. N., 1929. Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology. Macmillan Publishing Company, New York.

Whitehead, A. N., 1933. Adventures of Ideas. Cambridge Univ. Press, London.

Whitehead, A. N., 1939. Science in the modern world. Penguin, London.